

# The Numismatic Chronicle 179 Offprint

Elagabalus and the *Aedes Dei Invicti Solis*  
*Elagabali* in Rome: the Numismatic Evidence

*by*

BERNHARD E. WOYTEK

LONDON  
THE ROYAL NUMISMATIC SOCIETY  
2019



# Elagabalus and the *Aedes Dei Invicti Solis* *Elagabali* in Rome: the Numismatic Evidence<sup>1</sup>

BERNHARD E. WOYTEK

[PLATES 33-37]

The period of less than four years during which Varius Avitus ruled over the Roman Empire as Emperor Caesar M. Aurelius Antoninus Pius Felix Augustus (AD 218–222) continues to exert a particular fascination on scholars, as a seemingly uninterrupted series of recent publications on the boy-emperor ‘Elagabalus’ or ‘Heliogabalus’ demonstrates.<sup>2</sup> It comes as no surprise that his religious policy has always been at the centre of attention.<sup>3</sup> As is well known, the emperor – a priest of the Syrian sun god Elagabal in Emesa<sup>4</sup> – not only relocated the god’s sacred baetyl from Syria to Rome,<sup>5</sup> when he moved to the Empire’s capital after his accession, but eventually put the deity at the head of the Roman pantheon,<sup>6</sup> probably in late AD 220.<sup>7</sup> In Rome, the cult of

<sup>1</sup> This article was written in Oxford in the summer of 2019, during an E.S.G. Robinson Visiting Scholarship at the Ashmolean Museum, in association with a C.M. Kraay Visitorship at Wolfson College: I am most grateful to Chris Howgego for the kind invitation. Thanks are also due to Richard Abdy (London), Karsten Dahmen (Berlin), Dominique Hollard (Paris), Jérôme Mairat (Oxford), and Klaus Vondrovec (Vienna) for providing information on and images of coins kept in the collections they are in charge of, as well as to Andrew Burnett for discussing chronological problems with me. Finally, I would like to extend my thanks to a distinguished private collector for generously granting me permission to study the hitherto unpublished medallion which is at the centre of this contribution.

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, the monographs by L. de Arrizabalaga y Prado, *The Emperor Elagabalus: Fact or Fiction?* (Cambridge, 2010), and M. Icks, *The Crimes of Elagabalus. The Life and Legacy of Rome’s Decadent Boy Emperor* (Cambridge, MA, 2012). See also the (fairly idiosyncratic) monographs and collected volumes by L. de Arrizabalaga y Prado, *Varian Studies Volume One: Varius* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 2017); L. de Arrizabalaga y Prado – R. de la Fuente Marcos, *Varian Studies Volume Two: Elagabal* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 2017); L. de Arrizabalaga y Prado (ed.), *Varian Studies Volume Three: A Varian Symposium* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 2017). More substantive than the latter books is the monumental work by S.C. Zinsli, *Kommentar zur Vita Heliogabali der Historia Augusta* (Bonn, 2014).

<sup>3</sup> On which see primarily Th. Optendrenk, *Die Religionspolitik des Kaisers Elagabal im Spiegel der Historia Augusta*. Habelts Dissertationsdrucke, Reihe Alte Geschichte Heft 6 (Bonn, 1969), and M. Frey, *Untersuchungen zur Religion und Religionspolitik des Kaisers Elagabal*. Historia Einzelschriften 62 (Stuttgart, 1989).

<sup>4</sup> On some Roman provincial coin types of Syria an iconographic assimilation of the emperor to the sun god may be observed: see A. Lichtenberger, ‘Orientation matters: the obverse portrait of Elagabalus on some civic coins of Abila and other Syrian coins’, *INR* 10 (2015), pp. 155–68.

<sup>5</sup> On the baetyl of Emesa – in the context of other sacred stones of antiquity, especially from the Near East – see most recently K. Butcher, ‘Baetylmania: coinage and communal memory in the Roman East’, *Berytus* 56 (2016), pp. 235–55, especially 239–44. The term ‘baetyl’ is used in this article merely for the sake of convention; it is problematic, see Butcher pp. 237–9.

<sup>6</sup> Thus explicitly Cass. Dio 79.11.1 (Boiss. vol. 3, p. 462): ... ὅτι [sc. ὁ Αὐτοῦς εἶτε Ψευδαντωνῖνος, the emperor] καὶ πρὸ τοῦ Διὸς αὐτοῦ ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν [sc. τὸν Ἐλεγάβαλον]: ‘... that the emperor placed Elagabal before Jupiter himself’. See also Herod. 5.5.7 (instructions were given to the effect that in public sacrifices the name of the new god should precede those of all others) and HA Heliog. 7.4 (*omnes sane deos sui dei ministros esse aiebat*).

<sup>7</sup> Thus Frey, *Religion und Religionspolitik*, pp. 80–6.

the Syrian sun god was then led by the emperor as *sacerdos amplissimus Dei Invicti Solis Elagabali*, which was his full official religious title.<sup>8</sup> If the *Historia Augusta* is to be trusted on this point, Elagabalus' aim to completely redesign Roman state religion was made explicit by the transfer of venerable *pignora imperii* – first and foremost, the *palladium* – into the magnificent new sanctuary of the Syrian god on the Palatine.<sup>9</sup>

This temple, often referred to as *Elagabalium* in the modern literature,<sup>10</sup> although this precise form of the name is not attested in the ancient sources,<sup>11</sup> plays a rather prominent role in literary accounts of Elagabalus' rule, as will be discussed in greater detail below. According to the *Historia Augusta*, it was the most important public building project of the emperor in Rome.<sup>12</sup> For what it is worth, the 'Chronographer of 354' reports the temple's dedication as the only noteworthy event of the entire reign of Elagabalus.<sup>13</sup>

For more than one hundred years, the only available piece of contemporaneous numismatic evidence for that sanctuary has been a middle bronze in high relief originally in the collection of Francesco Martinetti (1833–1895), described and illustrated in the sale catalogue of the latter's collection in 1907.<sup>14</sup> The specimen, depicting a scene of sacrifice in the courtyard of a temple complex on its reverse,

<sup>8</sup> It is attested, most notably, on military diplomas, see *Roman Military Diplomas* (5 vols, London 1978–2006 = *RMD*) 1, no. 75, and *RMD* 4, nos 307–8. In official titulatures, this unheard-of title precedes the conventional title of *pontifex maximus*, which the emperor kept. For the new cult in the context of the traditional Roman cult of Sol, see S. Hijmans, 'Temples and priests of Sol in the City of Rome', *Museion, Series III* 10 (2010), pp. 381–427.

<sup>9</sup> HA Heliog. 3.4: *sed ubi primum ingressus est urbem* [sc. the emperor], *omissis, quae in provinciis gerebantur, Heliogabulum in Palatino monte iuxta <a>edes imperatorias consecravit eique templum fecit, studens et [...] Vest<a>e ignem et Palladium et anc[h]ilia et omnia Romanis veneranda in illud transferre templum*. Zinsli, *Kommentar*, pp. 359–61 believes – as others before him – that the transfer of most of the *pignora* may be fictitious; *contra*, with the most pertinent reference to Herod. 6.1.3 (see note 48 below), Frey, *Religion und Religionspolitik*, p. 74. On the *palladium*, see also Herod. 5.6.3f. and HA Heliog. 6.9: *signum tamen, quod Palladium esse credebat, abstulit et auro vinctum in sui dei templo locavit*. The statement about the emperor's plan to introduce solar monotheism in Rome in the passage HA Heliog. 3.4 (*id agens, ne quis Romae deus nisi Heliogabalus coleretur*; see also HA Heliog. 6.7 for the entire world), by contrast, is definitely not trustworthy (and clearly modelled on Christianity): see Optendrenk, *Religionspolitik*, pp. 97–100 and 105f.; Frey, *Religion und Religionspolitik*, p. 12; Icks, *Crimes of Elagabalus*, pp. 113f.; Zinsli, *Kommentar*, pp. 401f.

<sup>10</sup> See, for more recent examples, R. Turcan, *Héliogabale et le sacre du Soleil* (Paris, 1985), pp. 120–35, and C. Rowan, *Under Divine Auspices. Divine Ideology and the Visualisation of Imperial Power in the Severan Period* (Cambridge, 2012), pp. 191–8.

<sup>11</sup> For the closest version, *Eliogaballium*, used by the Chronographus anni CCCLIII, see note 13 below. In the title of this contribution it is called *aedes Dei Invicti Solis Elagabali*, after HA Heliog. 17.8 (see the following note) and the emperor's official titlature, respectively (see note 8 above).

<sup>12</sup> The two other building works mentioned in that source as having been conducted under Elagabalus concerned the renovation of the Colosseum and the completion of the baths of Caracalla: see HA Heliog. 17.8: *Opera publica ipsius praeter aedem Heliogabali dei, quem Solem alii, alii Iovem dicunt, et amphitheatri instauratio<nem> post exustionem et lavacrum in vico Sulpicio, quod Antoninus Severi filius coeperat, nulla extant*. On this passage, see Zinsli, *Kommentar*, pp. 571–3.

<sup>13</sup> Apart from the cash handout, which is mentioned for each emperor by the Chronographus anni CCCLIII, see Mommsen, *Chron. min.*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1892), p. 147: *Antoninus Eliogaballus [...] conged. X CCL. Eliogaballium dedicatum est. Occisus Romae*.

<sup>14</sup> A. Sambon – C. & E. Canessa, *Collections Martinetti & Nervegna. Médailles grecques et romaines, aes grave*. Galerie Sangiorgi (Palais Borghèse, Rome), 18 November 1907, p. 204, no. 2546 ('petit médaillon'), pl. 32.

was subsequently acquired by the Berlin coin cabinet and published by Heinrich Dressel in the catalogue of the Roman medallions in Berlin (**pl. 33, 2**).<sup>15</sup> Despite the lack of SC, Dressel was not completely sure that the piece really was a medallion, and not an as, as a remark in his commentary reveals.<sup>16</sup> However, new evidence that has come to light in the meantime demonstrates that we should not doubt the classification of the Martinetti/Berlin example as a presentation piece of small size. The purpose of this article is to present and discuss a unique, excellently preserved bronze medallion of Elagabalus of large module that shows an expanded and somewhat more elaborate version of exactly the same reverse type. The existence of this new medallion, which surfaced ten years ago, has been acknowledged in the more recent scholarly literature,<sup>17</sup> although it has never been published and analysed properly: this needs to be rectified. Furthermore, in what follows the relationship of this piece with a third unique Elagabalus medallion, acquired by the British Museum in 1992, will be explored.

### The new specimen

Medallion, Mint of Rome, struck 1 January – 11/12 March AD 222

Obv.: IMP CAES M. AVREL ANTONINVS PIVS FELIX AVG

Laureate bust of bearded Elagabalus to the right (the two wreath ties falling down the emperor's neck), in *paludamentum* and cuirass – with pteryges in evidence on the right shoulder –, seen in a half-frontal view. The *paludamentum* is held together by a round *fibula* on the right shoulder; its hem is decorated with a row of fringes on the left shoulder.<sup>18</sup> The emperor is wearing his (misleadingly so-called) 'horn', a curved cultic symbol, as part of his laurel wreath (at the latter's top); it is possibly to be identified as the dried tip of a bull's penis.<sup>19</sup> Dotted border.

<sup>15</sup> H. Dressel, *Die römischen Medaillone des Münzkabinetts der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin*, 2 vols (Dublin/Zurich, 1972), pp. 185–91. Acc. 61/1909 (10.69g, 12h). It was also published by F. Gnechchi, *I medaglioni romani*, 3 vols (Milan, 1912) [Vol. 1: Oro ed argento. Vol. 2: Bronzo. Parte prima – Gran modulo. Vol. 3: Bronzo. Parte seconda – Moduli minori. Parte terza – Medaglioni del Senato.], vol. 3, p. 41, no. 6, and pl. 152, no. 11. Gnechchi partly misdescribed the reverse and erroneously indicated that the piece was in his own collection.

<sup>16</sup> Dressel, *Medaillone*, p. 191. The specimen was catalogued as an as in *RIC* 4.2, Elagabalus 339 (where the reverse legend is given with SC, in error). It is identified as a medallion in *BMCRE* 5, vol. 1, p. 615, †. The specimen was ignored by Nathan T. Elkins in his recent survey of architecture on Roman coins – *Monuments in Miniature: Architecture on Roman Coinage* (New York, 2015), p. 103 –, who wrongly stated 'Macrinus, Diadumenian, and Elagabalus minted no architectural coin types at Rome'. Note that medallions are not generally excluded from Elkins' book.

<sup>17</sup> See e. g. Rowan, *Under Divine Auspices*, p. 194, as well as D. Calomino, *Defacing the Past. Damnation and Desecration in Imperial Rome* (London, 2016), p. 198.

<sup>18</sup> On this detail, occasionally in evidence on Roman coins and medallions from Marcus Aurelius and Commodus onwards (as well as in statuary), but often overlooked by scholars, see P. Bastien, *Le buste monétaire des empereurs romains*, vol. 1. Numismatique romaine. Essais, recherches et documents 19 (Wetteren, 1992), p. 238.

<sup>19</sup> E. Krenzel, 'Das sogenannte „Horn“ des Elagabal – Die Spitze eines Stierpenis. Eine Umdeutung als Ergebnis fachübergreifender Forschung', *JNG* 47 (1997), pp. 53–72, esp. 56–8. Her interpretation was ridiculed by W. Weiser, '„Elagabal mit Stierpenis-Hütchen“ – Animalphallokrat oder Weichteil-Wolpertinger?', *Geldgeschichte Nachrichten* 196 (March 2000), pp. 53–6, and criticised by Rowan,

Rev.: P M TR P – V – C–OS IIII P P (the legend starts at 9 o'clock and terminates at 3 o'clock)

Scene of sacrifice involving four persons in the elaborately depicted sanctuary of the *Deus Invictus Sol Elagabalus*.

The emperor standing to the front, looking left, wearing a headgear – probably a laurel wreath – and an ankle-length oriental priestly garment knotted at the front (where it is decorated with a disc-shaped buckle), holding a patera in his right hand, sacrificing to the left over a large altar. He is lowering his left arm. The altar is ornamented with three rows of three niches each; the niches of the two upper rows all show an indication of figural decoration in their centres: those of the top row display just dots, while those of the middle row seem to show persons. Atop the altar, a sacrificial fire (three flames visible). Behind the emperor, a shorter male person (whose head is at the height of the emperor's chest), also dressed in a garment knotted at the front, looking to the left and lowering his left arm like the emperor. At the other side of the altar, two probably female persons standing to the right, wearing headgears (stephanai?) and a different type of long garment, both bending their right arms; the person next to the altar is holding her right hand over it. The feet of the four persons and the base of the altar are hidden behind architectural structures in the foreground, on which see below.

The sacrifice takes place in front of a tetrastyle temple of Corinthian order, the façade of which is to be seen in the background. The centre of the temple, above the altar, appears to be empty;<sup>20</sup> its pediment is decorated with a standing figure in the centre and two seated (or reclining) figures in the corners. Atop the temple roof a somewhat indistinct statue group – probably a quadriga; at the two corners of the roof standing figures: on the left a man with his right arm akimbo, reaching up with his left; on the right a man reaching out with his right.

The entire lower half of the depiction is taken up by a detailed representation of architectural elements of the sanctuary other than the temple. At the centre, immediately beneath the sacrifice scene, the monumental entrance to the sacred precinct: three closed double doors (the metal fittings of which are in evidence), with two pairs of columns separating them, and two additional double columns flanking the outer doors at the left and right. On each of the

*Under Divine Auspices*, pp. 208–10, as well as A. Gariboldi, 'Elagabalo *invictus sacerdos*: l'imperatore fanciullo e la centralizzazione del sacro attraverso lo specchio delle monete', in: E.C. De Sena (ed.), *The Roman Empire during the Severan Dynasty: Case Studies in History, Art, Architecture, Economy and Literature* (Piscataway, NJ, 2013) = *American Journal of Ancient History*, new series 6–8 (2007–2009) [2013], pp. 515–39, at p. 528, who, however, all fail to provide viable alternative explanations. For a cautiously positive comment on Krenzel's interpretation, see Icks, *Crimes of Elagabalus*, p. 75.

<sup>20</sup> There is some unevenness in the field, between the central columns, but no clear structure. The corresponding spot of the reverse of the small medallion in Berlin does not show any object, either. For a numismatic depiction of the baetyl (in part clearly on a base) in the temple at Emesa, see provincial bronzes struck under Caracalla: *BMC Galatia, Cappadocia, and Syria*, Emisa 15–6.

four *epistylia*, miniature sculptures of a quadriga of horses drawing the sacred baetyl of Elagabal: the two quadrigas in the middle seen from the front, with the baetyl shown above the heads of the two central horses; the quadriga on the left depicted driving to the right, and the quadriga on the right to the left, with the respective baetyls above the croups of the horses (the chariot just slightly hinted at on the left).

To the left and right of the gates, two distyle wings of the hall enclosing the temple precinct (against which the gates are set back a little). The richly decorated wings have peaked roofs and are seen in perspective. The pediment on each side is decorated with a standing figure, atop each roof ridge an eagle with spread wings (the eagle on the right weakly struck). The front of each wing is richly decorated and divided into three zones: in the top compartment reliefs, in the centre round structures (*clipei*?) with uncertain design. The outer walls of the two wings are structured (indication of *opus quadratum*).

A broad flight of seven steps leads up to the gates of the sanctuary; in the foreground, depicted underneath the steps, there is a horizontal cross-hatched perimeter fence.

Dotted border.

Bronze (monometallic flan). Weight 46.25g; max. diameter 37mm; die-axis 12 o'clock. Slight traces of double striking on the obverse.

Northern Californian private collection. Privately purchased from Classical Numismatic Group in December 2009. **Pl. 33, 1** (original size) and **1a** (250%).

### Commentary

There is a close correspondence between the images on the new medallion and on the Berlin piece from the Martinetti collection in **pl. 33, 2**, although the reverse of the latter is much more crowded, in view of the lack of space: the Berlin piece has a maximum diameter of just 24mm. The complex image with the sacrificial scene was probably designed for a medallion of large module, and then had to be crammed onto a smaller die. The only major typological difference between the two pieces is in the obverse legend, which was shortened to IMP CAES M. AVR ANTONINVS PIVS AVG on the smaller specimen;<sup>21</sup> the reverse inscriptions are identical, apart from the legend breaks; both pieces lack the SC.

Perhaps it is not too bold to surmise that the two medallions of different modules were produced for distribution to separate groups of recipients, belonging to different segments (at the top end) of the Roman social hierarchy. In fact, there are structural parallels to the production of Roman bronze medallions with the same reverse type in different modules, both before and after Elagabalus. Already under Hadrian (AD 117–138), COS III medallions featuring the three sacred birds of the Capitoline triad

<sup>21</sup> For minor iconographic differences, which, however, add greatly to our understanding of the buildings depicted and the scene as such, see below.

on their reverses come in two sizes: in sestertius size or larger, and in middle bronze size.<sup>22</sup> Under Commodus, during the heyday of the classic Roman medallion, a few such cases are attested. For example, among the medallions depicting the *processus consularis* of this emperor on 1 January AD 190, dated TR P XVI IMP VIII COS VI in the reverse legends, most are of large module (see **pl. 34, 3**).<sup>23</sup> However, a medallion of smaller size with the very same reverse type – also featuring the *servus publicus* in the chariot, holding the wreath above the consul's head – is in the Oxford collection (**pl. 34, 4**).<sup>24</sup> Under Commodus, such medallions of small module were very rare; for Severus Alexander (AD 222–235), by contrast, an exceptional number of medallions of middle bronze size are attested.<sup>25</sup> One of them has a spectacular architectural reverse: the Colosseum, with the emperor sacrificing in front of the building. It seems to imply that the restoration works on the amphitheatre were completed under Severus Alexander. This piece has long been known and is kept in the British Museum;<sup>26</sup> its reverse legend reads PONTIF MAX TR P II COS P P (AD 222/23: see **pl. 34, 5**). Recently, a large bimetallic medallion featuring the very same reverse depiction has surfaced in the coin trade,<sup>27</sup> although it is slightly later in date, as evidenced by the PONTIF MAX TR P III COS P P reverse legend (AD 223/24: **pl. 34, 6**).

But let us return to the two medallions featuring the sacrifice in the sanctuary of the *Deus Invictus Sol Elagabalus*, which are strictly contemporaneous. These pieces were struck during the final two and a half months of Elagabalus' rule – and life: he was assassinated on 11 or 12 March 222, together with his mother Julia Soaemias, their bodies were thrown into the Tiber,<sup>28</sup> and *damnatio memoriae* was inflicted on both of them.<sup>29</sup> As Marcel Thirion and Elke Krenzel have remarked,<sup>30</sup> the cultic 'horn' gradually seems to have disappeared from the coinage of Elagabalus over the first months of AD 222, possibly as a reaction to growing opposition against the emperor's regime. It is, however, present on both medallions under consideration, featuring the sacrifice in the sacred precinct. In all probability, they were therefore issued at the very beginning of the year AD 222. It is interesting to note that among the few

<sup>22</sup> See P.F. Mittag, *Römische Medaillons. Caesar bis Hadrian. Second edition* (Stuttgart, 2012), pp. 153f., nos Hadr 32–3 and Hadr 34–5.

<sup>23</sup> Gneecchi, *Medaglioni*, vol. 2, p. 63, nos 103–105.

<sup>24</sup> See M.R. Kaiser-Raiß, *Die stadtrömische Münzprägung während der Alleinherrschaft des Commodus. Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung eines römischen Kaisers* (Frankfurt am Main, 1980), p. 121, no. 143+, with illustration on pl. 21, no. 4.

<sup>25</sup> See J.M.C. Toynbee, *Roman Medallions. With an Introduction to the Reprint Edition by W.E. Metcalf* (New York, 1986), pp. 150f.

<sup>26</sup> H.A. Grueber, *Roman Medallions in the British Museum* (London, 1874), p. 38, no. 2 (rev. depicted on pl. 38, fig. 4); both sides pictured by Toynbee, *Medallions*, pl. 29, no. 7. This specimen was catalogued as an as in *BMCRE* 6 (Severus Alexander 158), but I do not see any material basis for R.A.G. Carson's assumption that 'SC ... has probably been removed by tooling from the BM coin' (thus the note on no. 158). As indicated also by the extremely high relief of the piece, this must be a small medallion.

<sup>27</sup> Nomos AG 7 (15 May 2007), no. 183 (40g, 37mm, 12h).

<sup>28</sup> See Herod. 5.8.8f. and HA Heliog. 17.1–7 and 18.2.

<sup>29</sup> On which see Calomino, *Defacing the Past*, pp. 158–64.

<sup>30</sup> M. Thirion, *Le monnayage d'Élagabale (218–222)* (Brussels and Amsterdam, 1968), p. 13; Krenzel, 'Das sogenannte "Horn"', pp. 62f.

known imperial bronze medallions of Elagabalus another type was produced in early AD 222, too: this type of a large module, with the reverse legend *CONSERVATOR AVGVSTI* (with *COS IIII* in the exergue), shows a quadriga of horses to the left, drawing a chariot with the sacred baetyl, decorated with an eagle (above the horses, a star: **pl. 34, fig. 7**).<sup>31</sup> This reverse, with the same legend in the round, was also used for an earlier double aureus of the emperor kept in the Berlin collection,<sup>32</sup> as well as for aurei (rev. *CONSERVATOR AVG*: **pl. 34, 8**).

Like these numismatic images, the four sculptures of quadrigas, each carrying a baetyl, that adorned the *epistylia* of the gates of the sanctuary's precinct probably refer to the transfer of the stone from Syria to Rome.<sup>33</sup> Incidentally, the transport of the sacred stone in a driverless, richly decorated chariot is also described in detail by Herodianus (5.6.6f.), who, however, states that it was drawn by six instead of four horses. That the baetyl as such played an important role in the architectural decoration of the temple area may also be confirmed by a Corinthian pilaster-capital of Carrara marble found at the Roman forum. This capital of exceptional artistic quality is ornamented, among other things, with the sacred baetyl: it is decorated with an eagle with spread wings, holding a wreath in his beak, and flanked by two female deities; the capital was hypothetically attributed to the front halls of the temple complex of the sun god on the Palatine by Franz Studniczka.<sup>34</sup>

The two medallions with the sacrificial scene provide the only contemporary record of a total view of a sanctuary of the new sun god of Elagabalus. Herodianus is the one ancient literary source informing us that there were, in fact, two temples for the *Deus Invictus Sol Elagabalus* in and near Rome: the particularly magnificent one in the city centre – also mentioned in the *Historia Augusta* as being on the Palatine, as quoted above<sup>35</sup> –, allegedly surrounded by 'many altars', where the emperor performed daily sacrifices;<sup>36</sup> but also another temple in the *suburbium*, the outskirts

<sup>31</sup> Gnecci, *Medaglioni*, vol. 2, p. 79, no. 1 (listing two specimens in Paris and Vienna – the Vienna reference is wrong, as Klaus Vondrovec kindly informs me), with pl. 98, no. 2.

<sup>32</sup> Dressel, *Medaillone*, pp. 184f., no. 104.

<sup>33</sup> Thus Thirion, *Le monnayage d'Élagabale*, pp. 14f., and Frey, *Religion und Religionspolitik*, p. 78.

<sup>34</sup> See F. Studniczka, 'Ein Pfeilercapital auf dem Forum', *MDAI(R)* 16 (1901), pp. 273–82, esp. p. 280. For an extremely detailed treatment (also covering related material), see now de Arrizabalaga y Prado – de la Fuente Marcos, *Varian Studies Volume Two: Elagabal*, pp. 51–278. The capital is depicted also by Icks, *Crimes of Elagabalus*, fig. 13, and Rowan, *Under Divine Auspices*, p. 199.

<sup>35</sup> See note 9.

<sup>36</sup> Herod. 5.5.8f. ... νεών τε μέγιστον καὶ κάλλιστον κατασκευάσας τῷ θεῷ, βομούς τε πλείστους περὶ τὸν νεὼν ἰδρύσας, ἐκάστοτε προῖὼν ἔωθεν ἐκατόμβας τε ταύρων καὶ προβάτων πολὺ πλῆθος κατέσφαττε τοῖς τε βομοῖς ἐπετίθει, παντοδαποὺς ἀρώμασι σωρεύων, οἴνου τε τοῦ παλαιοτάτου καὶ καλλίστου πολλοὺς ἀμφορέας τῶν βομῶν προχέων, ὡς ρεῖθρα φέρεσθαι οἴνου τε καὶ αἵματος μεμιγμένου. (9) περὶ τε τοὺς βομούς ἐχόρευεν ὑπὸ παντοδαποῖς ἤχοις ὀργάνων, γύναϊά τε ἐπιχώρια ἐχόρευε σὺν αὐτῷ, περιθέοντα τοῖς βομοῖς, κύμβαλα ἢ τύμπανα μετὰ χειρὸς φέροντα. '... and he built an enormous and magnificent temple to the god, around which he set up many altars. Each day at dawn he came out and slaughtered a hecatomb of cattle and a large number of sheep which he placed upon the altars, loaded with every variety of spices. He poured out many jars of the oldest and finest wines in front of the altars, so that streams of blood and wine flowed together. Around the altars he danced to the sound of many different instruments, and local women danced with him, circling the altars with cymbals and drums in their hands' (translation by C.R. Whittaker [Loeb edition], with modifications by the author).

of the capital.<sup>37</sup> This latter sanctuary is the one where the god was conducted in a procession in summer, in the six-horse chariot described by Herodianus in the passage alluded to above. Unfortunately, the suburban temple currently cannot be localised with certainty.<sup>38</sup> Dressel cautiously suggested that the scene depicted on the medallions would have been set at the main sanctuary in the city centre of Rome,<sup>39</sup> and he was doubtless correct on that: the only temple of Elagabal attested in the numismatic material must be the principal one, not a filial sanctuary.

The question of why this temple appears on medallions of early AD 222 remains to be asked. The two chronologically relevant pieces of information regarding the new main temple of the god in Rome in the literary sources are to be found in late antique chronicles. The earlier of the two is an entry in the Chronicle of Jerome for the year AD 220, where we read: *Heliogabalum templum Romae aedificatum* ('The temple of Heliogabalus in Rome built').<sup>40</sup> The other is an entry in the *Chronica* of Cassiodorus, which in general depend on Jerome, curiously for the consulship of *Gratus et Seleucus* – thus, not for AD 220, but the following year, AD 221: *His cons. Heliogabalum templum Romae aedificatur*.<sup>41</sup> Elagabalus, whose *dies imperii* was 16 May 218, arrived in Rome after a long journey by land only in the summer of 219, perhaps in August or September,<sup>42</sup> probably together with the sacred baetyl.<sup>43</sup> Originally, the stone may have been set up in a temporary location,<sup>44</sup> but it seems reasonable to accept Jerome's testimony that building works on the temple were conducted (or started?) in AD 220, a few months after the new emperor had come to

<sup>37</sup> Herod. 5.6.6: κατεσκεύασε δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ προαστείῳ νεῶν μέγιστόν τε καὶ πολυτελέστατον, ἐς ὃν ἐκάστου ἔτους κατήγε τον θεὸν ἀκμάζοντος θέρους. 'In the outlying district of the city he constructed a vast, magnificent temple to which he brought the god each year at mid-summer' (translation by C.R. Whittaker).

<sup>38</sup> Ch. Bruun, 'Kaiser Elagabal und ein neues Zeugnis für den Kult des Sonnengottes Elagabalus in Italien', *Tyche* 12 (1997), pp. 1–5, discusses a Roman lead pipe inscribed *Dei Solis Invicti Magni Elagabal[i]* that was found in an imperial villa in the territory of Ladispoli (ancient Alsium) near Rome and attests a local cult site of the god. Bruun (p. 5, note 25) toys with the idea of identifying this cult site with Herodianus' ἐν τῷ προαστείῳ νεῶν μέγιστον, but rightly stresses that this is problematic. On the question of the localisation of the second temple of Elagabal mentioned by Herodianus see more recently also Rowan, *Under Divine Auspices*, pp. 199–201. She prefers not to adopt Bruun's idea, but to localise the second temple in the Sessorian Palace in the *Horti Spei Veteris*: thus already G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer. Second edition* (Munich, 1912), p. 366.

<sup>39</sup> *Medaillone*, p. 189.

<sup>40</sup> R. Helm, *Die Chronik des Hieronymus. Hieronymi Chronicon. Second edition* (Berlin, 1956), p. 214. Rowan, *Under Divine Auspices*, pp. 191 and 197, misinterprets this passage as indicating the dedication of the temple in that year: this is not what the text says.

<sup>41</sup> Th. Mommsen, *Chronica minora*, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1894), p. 145. On this chronological discrepancy, see Frey, *Religion und Religionspolitik*, p. 94.

<sup>42</sup> For the dates, see D. Kienast – W. Eck – M. Heil, *Römische Kaisertabelle. Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie. 6., überarbeitete Auflage* (Darmstadt, 2017), p. 165.

<sup>43</sup> Thus HA Heliog. 1.7: *quem e Suria secum advexit*; rightly accepted by Frey, *Religion und Religionspolitik*, p. 76. However, some researchers believe that the baetyl arrived in Rome only in AD 220: see, e. g., Thirion, *Le monnayage d'Élagabale*, p. 16. On the problem, see also H.R. Baldus, 'Zur Aufnahme des Sol-Elagabalus Kultes in Rom, 219 n. Chr.', *Chiron* 21 (1991), pp. 175–8, at p. 176.

<sup>44</sup> Thus Optendrenk, *Religionspolitik*, p. 84 on Aur. Vict. Caes. 23.1 (*translatoque Romam dei simulacro in palatii penetralibus altaria constituit*): 'vorläufige[r] Aufenthaltsort des Steines', immediately after its transfer.

Italy; perhaps they continued into the following year. Hence, the medallions of early AD 222 may have been issued to celebrate the temple's dedication<sup>45</sup> or a specific solemn sacrifice offered in front of it. In any case, the scene on the medallions – if taken 'literally' – implies that the sanctuary was fully functional by the beginning of AD 222; that a sacrifice is shown as taking place in the sacred precinct clearly indicates that the sanctuary was not under construction any more.<sup>46</sup>

The problems surrounding the localisation and interpretation of the main temple of the *Deus Invictus Sol Elagabalus* on the Palatine have been discussed for more than a century. For our purpose it will suffice to briefly summarise the main results of the debate. Let us start at the end. After the *damnatio memoriae* of the emperor Elagabalus, the cult of the *Deus Invictus Sol Elagabalus* was banished from Rome, as Cassius Dio confirms.<sup>47</sup> Elagabalus' successor Severus Alexander (AD 222–235) seems to have restored the sacred baetyl to the temple at Emesa, although this is not explicitly mentioned in the sources.<sup>48</sup> Thus, the huge sanctuary of the sun god in the centre of Rome, as seen on the medallions of Elagabalus, had to be put to a different use. Rare coins (see the denarius at **pl. 35, 9**) as well as medallions (**pl. 35, 10**) of the early phase of Alexander's principate, AD 224, show an aerial view of a temple in a sacred precinct accompanied by the legend IOVI VLTORI;<sup>49</sup> particularly the form of the entrance, with a monumental staircase leading up to three gates, characteristically flanked by two propylaea, seems to be identical with the structure depicted on the medallion of Elagabalus published here. Hence, as first suggested by Paul Bigot in 1911,<sup>50</sup> we may safely assume that Severus Alexander rededicated the temple complex of the *Deus Invictus Sol Elagabalus* to 'Jupiter the Avenger' – clearly a carefully pondered choice.<sup>51</sup> Under Severus Alexander, the temple is depicted as hexastyle on the coins and medallions, not as tetrastyle as under Elagabalus,<sup>52</sup> and

<sup>45</sup> As suggested by Turcan, *Héliogabale*, p. 123: 'une émission exceptionnelle (peut-être programmée pour l'inauguration de l'*Elagabium*)'.

<sup>46</sup> On a few cases in which projected and/or unfinished buildings were depicted (as completed!) in Roman coinage, see F. Prayon, 'Projektierte Bauten auf römischen Münzen', in: B. von Freytag gen. Löringhoff – D. Mannsperger – F. Prayon (eds), *Praestant Interna. Festschrift für Ulrich Hausmann* (Tübingen, 1982), pp. 319–30. However, these are rare exceptions.

<sup>47</sup> Cass. Dio 79.21.2 (Boiss. vol. 3, p. 473): ὁ τε Ἐλεγάβαλος αὐτὸς ἐκ τῆς Ῥώμης παντάπασιν ἐξέπεσε.

<sup>48</sup> Cp. HA Divus Aurel. 25.4, with Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus*, p. 366, note 8. The passage in Herod. 6.1.3, sometimes taken to refer to this repatriation to Syria, seems to mention the return of the *pignora imperii* instead: τὰ ἀγάλματα τῶν θεῶν, ἅπερ ἔτυχεν ἐκεῖνος κινήσας καὶ μεταγαγὼν, ἔπεμψαν ἐς τοὺς ἰδίας καὶ ἀρχαίους ναοὺς τε καὶ σηκοὺς ('the images of the gods, which the previous emperor had moved from their places and transferred, were returned to their own original temples and shrines', translation by C.R. Whittaker, adapted by the author).

<sup>49</sup> For references to specimens of these coins and medallions, see C. Rowan, 'Becoming Jupiter: Severus Alexander, the temple of Jupiter Ultor, and Jovian iconography on Roman imperial coinage', *AJN Second Series* 21 (2009), pp. 123–50, pp. 126 and 127, note 19.

<sup>50</sup> P. Bigot, 'Le temple de Jupiter Ultor et la Vigne Barberini', *Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma* 39 (1911), pp. 80–5.

<sup>51</sup> Bigot's interpretation was endorsed by, among others, Dressel, *Medaillone*, pp. 189f., and P.V. Hill, *The Monuments of Ancient Rome as Coin Types* (London, 1989), p. 34.

<sup>52</sup> This does not make a difference for its identification, because the die engravers could use their artistic licence in designing the dies.

shows a seated cult statue at the centre; there is still a quadriga at the temple roof.<sup>53</sup> So far, so uncontroversial.

As cited in the introduction to this contribution, the *Historia Augusta* (Heliog. 3.4) localises the sanctuary *in Palatino monte iuxta <a>edes imperatorias*. The seemingly more precise information provided at 1.6 – *et hic quidem prius dictus est Varius, post Heliogabalus a sacerdotio dei Heliogabali, cui templum Romae in eo loco constituit, in quo prius aedes Orci fuit* – is not immediately helpful, since a temple to Orcus is not known: the text after *prius* therefore is most probably corrupt. A perspicacious emendation by Filippo Coarelli,<sup>54</sup> building upon a suggestion by D.F. Brown,<sup>55</sup> replaces †*aedes Orci*† by *Adon(id)is horti* and may well restore the original text: flowering gardens are mentioned by Philostratus (Apoll. Tyan. 7.32) as being the essential part of an αὐλὴ Ἀδώνιδος in the area of the imperial palace on the Palatine at the time of Domitian.<sup>56</sup>

This conjecture is attractive in the light of recent archaeological research by the École française de Rome. Their excavations have confirmed the theory advanced by Paul Bigot in 1911,<sup>57</sup> according to which the monumental sanctuary of Elagabalus/Jupiter Ultor is to be located in the Vigna Barberini, on the Palatine between the *via sacra* and the Domus Augustana; the staircase leading up to the entrance seems to have been aligned with the arch of Titus to the northeast.<sup>58</sup> The temple complex was built on a large Flavian terrace of originally about 150 x 120 metres. The Flavian structures were apparently destroyed in a fire under Commodus in AD 191/192;<sup>59</sup> then the terrace was rebuilt and somewhat enlarged, and a Severan temple was constructed, perhaps during the reign of Septimius Severus or Caracalla; a second phase of building activity followed shortly thereafter. In this second phase, the monumental gate was constructed,<sup>60</sup> and this phase is presumably to be identified as the conversion of the pre-existing temple into the sanctuary of the *Deus Invictus Sol Elagabalus* by the emperor Elagabalus (for a map showing the structures of this phase, see **pl. 37, 18**). It is unclear to whom the original temple was dedicated.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>53</sup> In the light of this identity of the temples of Elagabalus and Jupiter Ultor, the passage HA Heliog. 17.8 may acquire additional meaning: here we read about the temple of the god Heliogabalus ‘*quem Solem alii, alii Iovem dicunt*’.

<sup>54</sup> F. Coarelli, *Palatium. Il Palatino dalle origini all'impero* (Rome, 2012), pp. 526–8; accepted by T.P. Wiseman, ‘The Palatine, from Evander to Elagabalus’, *JRS* 103 (2013), pp. 234–68, at p. 266.

<sup>55</sup> D.F. Brown, ‘The Temples of Jupiter Ultor and Sol Invictus’, *AJA* 42 (1938), p. 129 (in: ‘Thirty-Ninth General Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America [...], Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, December 28–30, 1937: summaries of papers’, pp. 121–9).

<sup>56</sup> By contrast, Zinsli, *Kommentar*, pp. 336f. follows the *editio princeps* of the vita in adopting the reading ‘*in quo prius aedes horti fuit*’; he thus manages to dispense with a more serious intervention in the text, but this solution seems problematic in terms of content: is ‘temple of the garden’ really a conceivable wording?

<sup>57</sup> See note 50 above.

<sup>58</sup> A meticulous documentation of the current state of the archaeological evidence is provided by F. Villedieu, *La Vigna Barberini*, vol. 2: *Domus, palais impérial et temples. Stratigraphie du secteur nord-est du Palatin* (Rome, 2007). See especially the ‘tableau récapitulatif des moments remarquables de l’histoire du site’ on p. [409].

<sup>59</sup> Villedieu, *Vigna Barberini*, pp. 261–3.

<sup>60</sup> Villedieu, *Vigna Barberini*, pp. 376–8.

<sup>61</sup> See the discussion of the problem by Villedieu, *Vigna Barberini*, pp. 379–89, and Coarelli, *Palatium*, pp. 510–4.

The new archaeological data from the French excavations may be used to test the complex hypothetical reconstruction of the sanctuary's history laid out by Philip Hill, mainly on the basis of the literary and numismatic evidence.<sup>62</sup> According to him, the structure converted into the *aedes Elagabali* around AD 220 was originally a temple of Jupiter Victor, erected by Domitian in replacement of a Republican predecessor building; he identifies this sanctuary of Jupiter Victor with an imposing temple flanked by colonnades, depicted in two issues of bronze coins of Trajan of the COS V period (see **pl. 37, 11**);<sup>63</sup> in this temple's *cella*, a seated male cult statue with sceptre and thunderbolt may be discerned. Hill's reconstruction has recently met with criticism,<sup>64</sup> although Françoise Villedieu, in her monograph on the site, does not condemn it at all.<sup>65</sup> I prefer not to go through the entire argument, but it may be helpful to discuss a sestertius type of Titus here that Hill failed to take into account, although it seems to have a bearing on the problem. It was struck in AD 80/81 and is known to me from a single specimen that turned up twice in auction sales in 1980 and 2016;<sup>66</sup> the type was inadvertently omitted from the new edition of *RIC* 2.1, published in 2007.<sup>67</sup> This sestertius of Titus shows a hexastyle temple of Corinthian order flanked by colonnades, featuring a seated male cult statue; his throne is richly decorated, he is holding a sceptre in his left hand and presumably a statue of Victory in his right (**pl. 35, 12 and 12a**). Overall, the architectural structure depicted looks much like the sanctuary shown on the sestertii of Trajan, although the statuary decoration of the pediment is different, and also one of the attributes of the cult statue, as just described: in the case of Titus, it is probably a Victory instead of a thunderbolt. The unique sestertius might thus strengthen Hill's hypothesis that the temple was originally dedicated to Jupiter Victor, but the construction of the building might have to be ascribed to the principate of Domitian's brother Titus rather than Domitian himself; the somewhat different decoration of the temple under Trajan might indicate a refurbishment – if it really is the same complex: but all this is purely speculative. In any case, the archaeological data proves that Elagabalus did not build the temple of his god *ex novo*, but that he merely adapted a pre-existing structure. Hence, the sanctuary could be opened within a relatively short time after the building works had started in AD 220, if one wants to accept the date given by Jerome.

The unusual prominence accorded to the monumental steps, the decorated gates and the flanking propylaea on the medallion of large module published here can probably be explained by the fact that these were the new parts of the sanctuary that Elagabalus had added. The temple as such, which was presumably redecorated

<sup>62</sup> Hill, *Monuments of Ancient Rome*, pp. 33–6.

<sup>63</sup> B. Woytek, *Die Reichsprägung des Kaisers Traianus* (98–117). *Moneta Imperii Romani* 14, 2 vols (Vienna, 2010), nos 253 (sestertii) and 305–7 (sestertii, dupondii and asses). For a high-quality colour enlargement of the reverse of the coin depicted at **pl. 37, 11** see A. Pangerl (ed.), *Portraits. 500 Years of Roman Coin Portraits. Second edition* (Munich, 2017), p. 258.

<sup>64</sup> Rowan, *Under Divine Auspices*, pp. 225f.

<sup>65</sup> See Villedieu, *Vigna Barberini*, pp. 382–9.

<sup>66</sup> Sternberg 10 (25 November 1980), 316 (with a good commentary on p. 38 of the catalogue) = Künker 280 (26 September 2016), 554 (28.00g). The sestertius is now kept in the same Northern Californian private collection as the Elagabalus medallion in **pl. 33, 1 and 1a**.

<sup>67</sup> The reference in the Künker sale catalogue is misleading: *RIC* 2.1 Titus 172 is a sestertius type featuring the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus without flanking colonnades; the reference coin cited is *BNCMER* III, Titus 176.

only slightly under him, appears just as a backdrop in the medallion image, above the sacrificers: it was not at the centre of the die-engraver's attention.<sup>68</sup> As for the steps leading up to the sacred precinct, a late literary source, the 'Life of Saint Sebastian', contains a passage valuable in our context. The Saint had been wounded by Mauretanian archers, but survived, was carried into safety and tended to by Saint Irene in her house near the Palatine.<sup>69</sup> After Sebastian had recovered, he is mentioned as talking to Diocletian 'standing on the steps of Heliogabalus' (*stans super gradus Heliogabali*).<sup>70</sup> The medallion image conveys the monumentality of the staircase that apparently continued to be associated with its builder not only long after the entire complex had been reappropriated by the traditional Roman religion, but even up to Christian times.

An object that the die engraver of the large medallion rendered with a lot of care is the large altar at which the emperor and his entourage are performing the sacrifice. This altar is among the most momentous elements of the reverse of the newly discovered piece, since it adds typological information that was not available on the Martinetti/Berlin specimen: on this medallion of small module, the altar is depicted indistinctly, in view of the constraints of space, and Heinrich Dressel even speculated 'es könnte auch ein breiter Dreifuß sein'.<sup>71</sup> However, the new specimen of large module not only demonstrates that it is in fact an altar, but also that it has a rather specific decoration: the latter corresponds closely to the decoration of an altar of the god at the Emesene temple, as known from the reverses of bronzes struck at the mint of Emesa in the name of Julia Domna between AD 215 and 217.<sup>72</sup> On these pieces exclusively the sculpted altar is depicted, not the sanctuary as such (see **pl. 35, 13**).<sup>73</sup> On the Syrian coin image, only two rows of three sculpted niches each are visible, instead of three as on the medallion; in each niche an anthropomorphic figure is to be discerned. The altar depicted on the new medallion does not appear in any other imperial coin type of the reign of Elagabalus, despite the fact that there are so many images of the ruler sacrificing at an altar or altar-like structure.

Another momentous detail of the image that is much clearer on the newly discovered medallion than on the Martinetti/Berlin specimen is the costume of the figure next to Elagabalus on the right. While Heinrich Dressel, in the publication of the small medallion, tentatively described the person as wearing a *toga* and holding a scroll,<sup>74</sup> the new specimen demonstrates that the man is not holding anything in his hand and that he is, more importantly, wearing exactly the same extravagant priestly garment as Elagabalus himself – which was made of silk, as the literary sources

<sup>68</sup> For a parallel to such an approach in the coin design of Trajan, see Woytek, *Reichsprägung des Traianus*, vol. 1, p. 113, commentary on no. 175: in the image of the Circus maximus on Trajanic sestertii, the front of the circus is prominently displayed, since it was added by Trajan.

<sup>69</sup> Acta Sancti Sebastiani Martyris, in *Acta Sanctorum, Ianuarii tomus secundus* (Paris, 1863), p. 642, §86: *eum viventem adduxit ad domum suam in scala excelsa ubi manebat ad Palatium*.

<sup>70</sup> *Acta Sanctorum, Ianuarii tomus secundus*, p. 642, §87.

<sup>71</sup> Dressel, *Medaillone*, p. 186, Anm. 3.

<sup>72</sup> *BMC Galatia, Cappadocia, and Syria*, Emisa 9–12 (the coins are dated according to the Seleucid Era).

<sup>73</sup> On coins of this type with a curiously mutilated reverse, see Calomino, *Defacing the Past*, pp. 197–9.

<sup>74</sup> Dressel, *Medaillone*, pp. 186f.: 'ein, wie es scheint, mit der Toga bekleideter Mann, der in der L. eine Rolle hält'.

report.<sup>75</sup> Who, then, is standing next to the emperor, and who are the women on the other side of the altar?

There are good grounds for identifying the small attendant, depicted in hierarchical proportion to Elagabalus, as his cousin Alexianus/Alexander, the future emperor, who was adopted by Elagabalus and promoted to the rank of Caesar on 26 (?) June AD 221.<sup>76</sup> According to Herodianus, Alexianus had been serving in – or at least been destined for – the religious service of the sun god Elagabal, like his cousin, already back in Emesa.<sup>77</sup> In Rome, Elagabalus wanted his Caesar to share his priesthood with him; Herodianus specifically mentions that the emperor also wished him to wear the same dress (*σχήμασι ... ὁμοίους*).<sup>78</sup>

Documentary sources confirm this report about the religious role of the new Caesar. In military diplomas of late AD 221 and early AD 222, *M. Aurel(l)ius Alexander* is given the most unusual title *nobilissimus Caesar imperi et sacerdotis*.<sup>79</sup> Hence, his role was firmly tied to the priesthood of the *sacerdos amplissimus Dei Invicti Solis Elagabali*. Alexander, four years Elagabalus' junior, was designated to the consulship together with the Augustus in the summer of AD 221, after his elevation to the rank of Caesar, and they entered upon the consulate together on 1 January AD 222. Thus, at the time when the medallions with the sacrifice scene were presumably handed out, Elagabalus and Alexianus/Alexander were both consuls. These presentation pieces probably show a sacrifice to the *Deus Invictus Sol Elagabalus* performed by the two consuls in their oriental priestly dress, perhaps on the very day of their assumption of office. Whether this was also the day of the dedication ceremony of the rebuilt sanctuary, we cannot tell for sure.

As for the two female persons taking part in the sacrifice at the other side of the altar, it seems natural to assume that they are not to be regarded as anonymous attendants, but that they, too, belonged to the imperial family. Cassius Dio specifically mentions the mother and grandmother of Elagabalus, Julia Soaemias and Julia Maesa, as active participants in the cult of the sun god.<sup>80</sup> Hence, it is likely that these two women are

<sup>75</sup> On the priestly attire of Elagabalus see now in great detail E. Krenzel, 'Varius' Vestments', in: L. de Arrizabalaga y Prado (ed.), *Varian Studies Volume Three: A Varian Symposium* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 2017), pp. 43–57. The principal literary source is Cass. Dio 79.11.2 (Boiss. vol. 3, p. 462): ... καὶ μέντοι καὶ ὅτι τὴν ἐσθῆτα τὴν βαρβαρικὴν, ἣ οἱ τῶν Σύρων ἱερεῖς χρῶνται, καὶ δημοσίᾳ πολλὰκις ἐφωρᾶτο ἐνδεδυμένος. See furthermore Herod. 5.3.6 and 5.5.3–6 (see §4 for the mention of silk) as well as HA Heliog. 23.3–5.

<sup>76</sup> See Kienast – Eck – Heil, *Kaisertabelle*, p. 171.

<sup>77</sup> See Herod. 5.3.4: ἱερῶντο δὲ αὐτοὶ θεῷ ἡλίῳ, 'both were dedicated to the service of the sun god' (translation C.R. Whittaker), with the important commentary by Whittaker ad loc.

<sup>78</sup> Herod. 5.7.4f. ὥς δὲ Καῖσαρ ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος ἀπεδείχθη, ὁ Ἀντωνῖνος αὐτὸν ἐβούλετο τὰ ἑαυτοῦ παιδεύειν ἐπιτηδεύματα, ὀρχεῖσθαι τε καὶ χορεύειν τῆς τε ἱερωσύνης κοινωνεῖν καὶ σχήμασι καὶ ἔργοις ὁμοίους. ('After Alexander's appointment as Caesar, Antoninus wanted to train him in his own pursuits of leaping and dancing, and wanted him to share in his priesthood by wearing the same dress and following the same practices', translation by C.R. Whittaker, with modifications by the author).

<sup>79</sup> *RMD* 1, no. 75, and *RMD* 4, nos 307–8; see especially no. 307 (dated 29 November AD 221, now kept in the Louvre), published and discussed by W. Eck, 'Ein neues Militärdiplom für die misenische Flotte und Severus Alexanders Rechtsstellung im J. 221/222', *ZPE* 108 (1995), pp. 15–34. On the relationship between Elagabalus and his Caesar, see Frey, *Religion und Religionspolitik*, pp. 104f.

<sup>80</sup> Cass. Dio 79.11.3 (Boiss. vol. 3, p. 464): ... τὰς τε βαρβαρικὰς ὥδᾳς ἃς ὁ Σαρδανάπαλλος τῷ Ἐλεγαβάλῳ ἤδε τῇ μητρὶ ἅμα καὶ τῇ τήθῃ. In Cassius Dio's usage the word *τηθίς/τήθη* means

shown next to the altar. The wife of Elagabalus at that time, Iulia Aquilia Severa, was a Vestal virgin,<sup>81</sup> and therefore she would probably not have been depicted as performing sacrifice to the sun god.

The scene on the reverse of the two medallions featuring the sacrificial scene in front of the temple needs to be compared to the reverse of another unique medallion of Elagabalus published only recently, albeit in a rather summary fashion,<sup>82</sup> as well as to a couple of imperial coin types of the emperor's rule: this comparison will allow us to appreciate the genesis of the iconography employed.

### Comparative material

Medallion, Mint of Rome, undated (perhaps of AD 219–220?)

Obv.: (in the round) [IMP] ANTONINVS [ \_\_\_\_ ]AV[ \_ ]  
(in the 'exergue') AVG[VSTI]

Confronted busts of Elagabalus to the right and one of his wives, perhaps his first wife Julia Paula, to the left. The emperor is laureate (the two wreath ties are falling down his neck), without the 'horn', and beardless; he is wearing the *paludamentum* and cuirass – with pteryges in evidence on the right shoulder –, seen from behind. The hair of the Augusta is tucked into a small chignon at the base of her head and does not cover her ear; she is wearing a stephane and a palla, and her bust is in a half-frontal view.

Rev.: [ \_\_\_\_ ]R · IMPER[..]

Scene of sacrifice involving four persons, in front of the sacred baetyl of the *Deus Invictus Sol Elagabalus*.

The emperor standing to the front, looking left, wearing an oriental priestly garment knotted at the front (where it is decorated with a disc-shaped buckle), holding a patera in his right hand, sacrificing to the left over a small, narrow altar of oriental type, with a fire on it. He is lowering his left arm. Between the altar and the emperor, a pointed priestly headgear with a bent top. Behind the emperor stands a smaller probably male person, wearing a round cap (?), also dressed in a garment knotted at the front, looking to the left and bending his left arm. At the other side of the altar, two probably female persons standing to the right, wearing a different type of long garment.

grandmother, not aunt, see 78.38.1 (Boiss. vol. 3, p. 447): ταῖς μητράσι τῇ τε τήθῃ. On the role of the two women, see also Optendrenk, *Religionpolitik*, pp. 96f.

<sup>81</sup> Kienast – Eck – Heil, *Kaisertabelle*, p. 167.

<sup>82</sup> C.L. Clay, 'A hitherto unpublished coin of Elagabalus', in: L. de Arrizabalaga y Prado (ed.), *Varian Studies Volume Three: A Varian Symposium* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 2017), pp. 22–3. On this volume, see the review by C. Rowan, 'Perspectives on Elagabalus', *CR* 69.1 (2018), pp. 248–51; on Clay's contribution, see p. 248: it is not a full article, but merely a summary of a paper, without notes. The medallion is also depicted and described in Arrizabalaga y Prado, *Emperor Elagabalus*, pp. 80f. and 101, and Rowan, *Under Divine Auspices*, pp. 194f.

In the centre of the image, above the altar, the sacred baetyl is visible, decorated with an eagle with spread wings. The baetyl is perhaps set onto a base (?)<sup>83</sup> It is flanked by a cultic standard (σημεῖον) on either side.

Dotted border.

Orichalcum (monometallic flan); flan cracks at 2 o'clock and 4 o'clock (seen from the obverse). Letters on the obverse strengthened during cleaning?

Weight 12.72g; max. diameter 33mm; die-axis 12 o'clock.

British Museum, reg. no. 1992,0509.364. Purchased from Curtis L. Clay, who had acquired it from Baldwin's in September 1973. **Pl. 36, 14** (original size) and **14a** (150%).

This medallion unfortunately is not well preserved and struck on a short (and rather thin) flan. Its reverse is somewhat off-centre, and the legends are partly illegible, because they are not on the flan or very worn. Close examination of the piece in London has made it clear that, apart from the name of the emperor, the one part of the obverse legend that can partly be read and partly reconstructed with certainty is the word AVG[VSTI] underneath the busts. This word is attested in the same position on later medallions featuring the confronted busts of Severus Alexander and his wife Orbiana.<sup>84</sup> The identification of the Augusta on the obverse is a priori uncertain, since coins were struck in the name of all three of Elagabalus' wives: Iulia Cornelia Paula, Iulia Aquilia Severa and Annia Faustina.<sup>85</sup> Theoretically his mother Soaemias or even his grandmother Maesa could have been depicted as well, but the hairstyle definitely rules this out: in Maesa's case, her hair invariably covers the ear completely, and in the case of Soaemias it often does, with sometimes just the tip of her earlobe being visible; the hair never goes around the ear, as on the medallion.<sup>86</sup>

This leaves us with the choice of one of three wives of Elagabalus, and it is a difficult one, with only minor clues available to base a decision on. The imperial coinage of the third wife Annia Faustina is of the utmost rarity, since the marriage was the shortest of the three: it started in the summer of 221, and Elagabalus dismissed Faustina probably at the end of the same year. No medallions proper struck

<sup>83</sup> On the capital from the Forum Romanum, the stone is standing 'auf dem mit Fransentuch verhangenen, löwenfüssigen Stuhle': Studniczka 'Pfeilercapitell', p. 274. On the manner in which the stone may have been set up in the Emesene temple, see Studniczka, 'Pfeilercapitell', p. 275, as well as the provincial bronze coins from Emesa cited in note 20 above.

<sup>84</sup> See Gnechi, *Medaglioni*, vol. 2, pl. 102, nos 2–3, and vol. 3, pl. 153, no. 9.

<sup>85</sup> For the basic dates of the Augustae, see Kienast – Eck – Heil, *Kaisertabelle*, pp. 166–8. However, on p. 166 there is a misleading indication regarding the date of Elagabalus' first marriage to Julia Paula: '220 (vor Ende Aug.)' is merely a *terminus ante quem* for the wedding, which cannot have taken place as late as 220; see below.

<sup>86</sup> For Soaemias, this may be verified also on the silver medallion in Paris depicted by Gnechi, *Medaglioni*, vol. 1, pl. 22, no. 8 (ear covered). For the hairstyles of the imperial women of the reign of Elagabalus on coins in general see H.B. Wiggers – M. Wegner, *Caracalla, Geta, Plautilla. Macrinus bis Balbinus*. Das römische Herrscherbild 3.1 (Berlin, 1971), pls 35–7 and 42–3; see also the useful brief overview for the silver coinage in D. Schaad (ed.), *Le trésor d'Eauze. Bijoux et monnaies du III<sup>e</sup> siècle après J.-C.* (Toulouse, 1992), p. 219.

in her name (or featuring her portrait) seem to be attested.<sup>87</sup> It is therefore rather unlikely that she should be depicted opposite her husband on the London medallion. Hence, Julia Paula or Aquilia Severa?<sup>88</sup> Both are attested on authentic medallions. Aquilia Severa appears on a unique bronze medallion where her portrait faces that of Elagabalus.<sup>89</sup> However, the empress there does not wear a stephane, as on the London piece. Hence, the argument advanced by Clare Rowan, according to which the lady on the London medallion studied here is ‘probably Aquilia’, merely because she appears on another medallion with confronted busts, does not seem cogent.<sup>90</sup> The London medallion may therefore rather portray Elagabalus’ first wife Julia Paula, for whom in general a greater quantity of imperial coinage was produced than later for Aquilia Severa.<sup>91</sup> In Julia’s name alone doubtless authentic silver medallions were struck on which her portrait is shown on the obverse facing left and wearing a stephane (pl. 36, 15);<sup>92</sup> the hairstyle and general portrait features are in agreement with the female bust on the London bronze medallion, although the portrait on the large silver piece is, of course, more elaborate. Furthermore, comparison with well-preserved sestertii featuring portraits of Julia Paula and Aquilia Severa confirms that the empress depicted opposite Elagabalus on the London medallion looks like Paula rather than Severa.<sup>93</sup> What remains of the obverse legend next to the female portrait of the London specimen may perhaps support the proposed attribution: the letters AV, followed by another indistinct letter, seem to be in evidence there, and in view of the word AVG[VSTI] underneath the two busts, they cannot possibly belong to the abbreviated word AVG behind the female bust. They may be part of the name [IVLIA P]AV[LA] instead.

If this identification is correct, the London medallion may be assigned to the years AD 219–220 (more probably to the latter year, in view of the reverse, on which see below): Elagabalus married Julia Paula soon after his arrival in Rome, in a lavish wedding that occasioned distributions, public banquets and games,<sup>94</sup> and dismissed her perhaps in autumn 220.<sup>95</sup> Such a dating is absolutely consistent with

<sup>87</sup> The specimen in her name listed as *RIC* Elagabalus 233 (the authenticity of which is doubted in a footnote in *RIC*) is, in fact, not a medallion – as per *RIC* – but a pseudo-medallion: it is of exactly the same type as the sestertii in the name of the empress. The piece will be discussed by this author in another contribution.

<sup>88</sup> According to Wiggers – Wegner, *Caracalla... bis Balbinus*, pp. 167–70, no portrait busts can confidently be attributed to either of these Augustae.

<sup>89</sup> Gneccchi, *Medaglioni*, vol. 2, pl. 97, no. 2 (Paris; rev. SPES PVBLICA).

<sup>90</sup> Rowan, *Under Divine Auspices*, p. 194. Clay, ‘Unpublished Coin of Elagabalus’, p. 23, prefers not to decide: ‘a woman who may be one of his wives’.

<sup>91</sup> See the rough statistics in Wiggers – Wegner, *Caracalla... bis Balbinus*, p. 167.

<sup>92</sup> Gneccchi, *Medaglioni*, vol. 1, p. 46, no. Giulia Paola 1 (pl. 22, no. 7: Berlin; unique); Dressel, *Medaillone*, pp. 191f., no. 106.

<sup>93</sup> Compare Pangerl, *Portraits*, p. 139, nos 371 and 372.

<sup>94</sup> Cass. Dio 79.9.1–3 (Boiss. vol. 3, p. 463).

<sup>95</sup> On the chronological evidence for Elagabalus’ marriage to Julia Paula, see J. Rea, ‘A letter of the Emperor Elagabalus’, *ZPE* 96 (1993), pp. 127–32, especially p. 130. Alexandrian coins in her name were produced exclusively in regnal years 3 and 4, covering the period from 29 August AD 219 to 28 August AD 221; in year 3, Paula is the only wife for whom coins were made, but issues of year 4 are also known for the two other wives, thus attesting a quick succession of divorces and re-marriages in the latter period. Thanks to Andrew Burnett for confirming that the numismatic evidence as presented by Rea is still valid; Alexandrian coins in Paula’s name of year 2, reported earlier, were in fact misread.

the portrait of Elagabalus on this piece, without beard or whiskers, which has good parallels on coins precisely in AD 219/220.<sup>96</sup> It also fits well with the date of the most important numismatic comparandum of the reverse of the London piece: a special issue of antoniniani from the mint of Rome that feature, on their reverse, the emperor sacrificing by himself in front of the sacred baetyl, shown in a frontally depicted quadriga. So far, only three specimens of this type have been recorded; for the coin in the Vienna cabinet – the first to become known – see **pl. 36, 16 and 16a**.<sup>97</sup> The obverse legend of this type, which has convincingly been dated to AD 219/220,<sup>98</sup> reads IMP ANTONINVS PIVS AVG. Its reverse legend is CONSERVATOR AVG, an inscription also attested on other coins of Elagabalus depicting the sacred stone (see, e.g., **pl. 34, 8**), which determined Curtis Clay's plausible reconstruction of the reverse legend of the London medallion to [CONSERVATO]R IMPER[II].<sup>99</sup> The overall composition of the reverse image of these antoniniani as well as several details of the depiction directly correspond to the medallion reverse: (i) both sacrifices take place in front of the sacred baetyl, which is decorated with an eagle and flanked by what are probably cultic standards.<sup>100</sup> (ii) In both cases, the emperor is sacrificing on a small altar of the same (oriental) type;<sup>101</sup> this kind of altar also occurs for example on denarii of Elagabalus showing the emperor sacrificing on his own, accompanied by the legend INVICTVS SACERDOS AVG (see **pl. 36, 17**). (iii) On both reverses, an oriental headgear with a bent top is depicted, doubtless a priestly tiara of some sort.<sup>102</sup> On the antoniniani it is shown in the left field, next to the outermost horse, while it appears on the ground, next to the altar, on the medallion. In very rare instances,

Hence, earlier treatments of the chronology are unreliable, e.g. Frey, *Religion und Religionspolitik*, pp. 88f.; the relevant entry in Kienast – Eck – Heil, *Kaisertabelle*, p. 166 is misleading: see note 85 above.

<sup>96</sup> In checking the portrait against portraits of Elagabalus on all the bronzes of his reign kept in the BM collection, I have noted a close stylistic similarity to the portrait on the middle bronze *BMCRE* 5, Elagabalus 365 (rev. ADVENTVS AVGVSTI, AD 219/220?).

<sup>97</sup> KHM Vienna, inv. RÖ 43082 (4.77g, 11h; acquired from Otto Voetter in 1931); first published by R. Delbrueck, *Die Münzbildnisse von Maximinus bis Carinus. Das römische Herrscherbild* 3.2 (Berlin, 1940), 'Beilage 8 zu S. 168', no. 26. The coin is mentioned by K. Pink, 'Der Aufbau der römischen Münzprägung in der Kaiserzeit. II. Von Caracallas Regierungsantritt bis zum Tode Elagabals', *NZ* 67 (= N.F. 27, 1934), pp. 3–17, at p. 12 (under AD 220), where it is erroneously identified as 'Binio, Abschl(ag) in Wien'. Further specimens: Eauze hoard, see Schaad, *Le trésor d'Eauze*, p. 152, type no. 301, and pp. 228f., pictured at pl. 20, no. 820 (4.86g); *Numismatica Ars Classica* 29 (11 May 2005), 596 (5.66g) = Heritage NYINC Signature Sale 3071 (6 January 2019), 32178 (5.65g, 12h). The coins come from two obverse and three reverse dies; the pieces in trade and from the Eauze hoard share the same obverse die.

<sup>98</sup> See the exhaustive discussion by F. Dieulafait in Schaad, *Le trésor d'Eauze*, p. 229.

<sup>99</sup> Clay, 'Unpublished coin of Elagabalus', p. 23.

<sup>100</sup> On which see Frey, *Religion und Religionspolitik*, pp. 60–3, followed by C. Rowan, 'The procession of Elagabalus and the problem of the parasols', *Journal of the Numismatic Association of Australia* 17 (2006), pp. 114–9. Traditionally, the objects had been interpreted as parasols, see E.W. Klimowsky, 'Sonnenschirm und Baldachin. Zwei Sinnbilder der irdischen und himmlischen Würde, insbesondere auf antiken Münzen', *SM* 13/14, issue 55 (1964), pp. 121–34, at pp. 133f.

<sup>101</sup> On the type of altar, see Krenkel, 'Varius' Vestments', p. 44: 'small two-level smoking altar', 'typical of Oriental cults, and new to Roman imperial coinage'.

<sup>102</sup> On the tiara, see Krenkel, 'Varius' Vestments', p. 48; Elagabalus' headgear, glittering with gold and precious stones, is mentioned by Herod. 5.5.3; see also HA Heliog. 23.5.

the same headgear is also depicted on denarii, next to the emperor sacrificing (see **pl. 36, 17**); in *RIC* the object was misidentified as a horn, because of its shape.<sup>103</sup>

Hans Roland Baldus proposed identifying the iconographic source of the antoninianus reverse as a painting mentioned by Herodianus.<sup>104</sup> Allegedly, the emperor had ‘a very large picture of himself painted, as he appeared in public performing as a priest; also in the picture was an image of the local god, to whom he was offering sacrifice’; before the emperor travelled from Nicomedia to Italy, this painting was sent to Rome and hung up in the senate house in order for ‘the senators and the Roman people to get used to the sight of Elagabalus’ clothes’ – his unusual oriental priestly garb.<sup>105</sup> Herodianus’ story has been criticised as not being credible, although it is in principle very likely that paintings of rulers circulated in the Roman empire – why not of Elagabalus, too?<sup>106</sup> Much more problematic than the story itself is its interpretation by Baldus, it seems to me. On this antoninianus reverse the emperor is not shown in his characteristic ankle-length priestly vestment in evidence, for example, on the London medallion as well as on the two medallions displaying the sacrifice in the sanctuary of Elagabalus: surprisingly, he is wearing what seems to be an ordinary short tunic and boots on the silver coins.<sup>107</sup> Hence, this image would not have been suitable at all for accustoming the Roman public to the sight of the new emperor in his unusual attire – but allegedly this was the whole purpose of the painting commissioned by the emperor in the winter of AD 218/19.<sup>108</sup> Baldus’ hypothesis must therefore, in all probability, be rejected.

Be that as it may, the reverse designs of the special antoniniani and the London medallion are evidently related, although, on the medallion, Elagabalus wears his typical priestly garment and does not hold a lowered branch in his right hand, and instead of the four horses four sacrificers surround the baetyl. The scene on the medallion may have been inspired by the antoninianus reverse, or it may have been designed slightly later in AD 220, perhaps by the same artist. In this respect, the broadening of the message in its reverse legend may be relevant, if the latter is reconstructed correctly: Elagabal is not only invoked as the guardian of the emperor, but of the empire as such. Iconographically, the reverse of the London medallion certainly prefigures the central scene on the large medallion of AD 222 first published here, featuring a sacrifice to the *Deus Invictus Sol Elagabalus* in front of his temple on the Palatine.

<sup>103</sup> See the description of *RIC* Elagabalus 86. The object first seems to have been identified correctly by J. Evans, ‘A hoard of Roman coins’, *NC third series* 18 (1898), pp. 126–84, at pp. 179f. (‘a Phrygian cap or *mitra*, such as was worn by priests’), but his interpretation was not immediately taken up; see also Thirion, *Le monnayage d’Élagabale*, pp. 54f.

<sup>104</sup> H. R. Baldus, ‘Das ‹Vorstellungsgemälde› des Heliogabal. Ein bislang unerkanntes numismatisches Zeugnis’, *Chiron* 19 (1989), pp. 467–76.

<sup>105</sup> Herod. 5.5.6f.: [sc. ὁ Ἀντωνῖνος] βουλόμενος ἐν ἔθει γενέσθαι τῆς του σχήματος ὄψεως τὴν τε σύγκλητον καὶ τὸν δῆμον Ῥωμαίων κτλ.

<sup>106</sup> See Rowan, *Under Divine Auspices*, p. 181 for a discussion.

<sup>107</sup> Thus correctly Krenkel, ‘Varius’ Vestments’, p. 43.

<sup>108</sup> Baldus himself was aware of this difficulty and – most implausibly – proposed that the emperor’s tunic on the antoniniani appears ‘offenbar aufgrund eines Versehens des Stempelschneiders’ (‘‹Vorstellungsgemälde›’, p. 470, with the long note 17, indicating the author’s misgivings regarding his own theory). The postulate of a die engraver’s error can effectively be ruled out now that we know three different reverse dies of the type – see note 96 above: they all show the emperor in the same dress.

## Key to Plates

(Copyright of images from the trade is with the respective firms or the photographers working on their behalf.)

- 1 Elagabalus (218–222), bronze medallion. Not in the reference works. Private collection. Technical data: see description above. Photos author.
- 1a As 1, pictured at 250%.
- 2 Elagabalus (218–222), bronze medallion of middle bronze size. Dressel, *Medaillone*, no. 105. Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Münzkabinett 18205364, Acc. 1909/61 (10.69g, 12h, 24mm). <<https://ikmk.smb.museum/object?id=18205364>>. © Münzkabinett, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Photos by Reinhard Saczewski.
- 3 Commodus (177–192), bronze medallion. Gnecci, *Medaglioni*, vol. 2, Commodo no. 104. Bertolami – Art Coins Roma 12 (29 October 2014), 845 (59.06g, 12h, 40mm).
- 4 Commodus (177–192), bronze medallion of middle bronze size. Kaiser-Raiß, *Münzprägung*, pl. 21, no. 4. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, Heberden Coin Room, no. 13641 (13.44g; 11h; 28mm). © Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford.
- 5 Severus Alexander (222–235), bronze medallion of middle bronze size. BMCRE 6, Severus Alexander 158 (catalogued as an as) = Grueber, *Medallions*, p. 38, no. 2. British Museum, Department of Coins and Medals, reg. no. 1872,0709.409 (9.39g, 12h, 27mm). © The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 6 Severus Alexander (222–235), bimetallic medallion. Not in the reference works. Nummorum Auctiones 8 (4 December 1997), 313 = Nomos AG 7 (15 May 2013), 183 (40.00g, 12h, 37mm).
- 7 Elagabalus (218–222), bronze medallion. Gnecci, *Medaglioni*, vol. 2, Eliogabalo no. 1. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Cabinet des médailles. Reproduced after Gnecci, vol. 2, pl. 98, no. 2.
- 8 Elagabalus (218–222), aureus. RIC 61 (bust d). NAC 72 (16 May 2013), 698 (6.50g).
- 9 Severus Alexander (222–235), denarius. RIC 146 (corr. bust: draped and cuirassed to the right, seen from behind). Gorny & Mosch 244 (6 March 2017), 568 (3.55g).
- 10 Severus Alexander (222–235), bronze medallion. Gnecci, *Medaglioni*, vol. 2, Alessandro Severo no. 7 (but on a monometallic flan, not a bimetallic one, as the specimens listed by Gnecci). Northern Californian private collection, ex CNG Triton 16 (9 January 2013), 1109 (55.76g, 12h, 37mm).
- 11 Trajan (98–117), sestertius. Woytek, *Reichsprägung des Traianus*, no. 253f. Künker 273 (14 March 2016), 710 (25.61g, 34mm).
- 12 Titus (79–81), sestertius. Not in RIC 2.1. Northern Californian private collection, ex Künker 280 (26 September 2016), 554 (28.00g, 35mm).
- 12a As 13, pictured at 150%.
- 13 Emesa, Syria, Julia Domna (193–217), bronze, year 527 of the Seleucid Era (= AD 215/16). BMC *Galatia, Cappadocia, and Syria*, Emisa 9. Naumann 43 (1 May 2016), 768 (11.39g, 24mm).
- 14 Elagabalus (218–222), bronze medallion. Not in the reference works. Clay, ‘Unpublished coin of Elagabalus’, pp. 22–3. British Museum, Department of Coins and Medals, reg. no. 1992,0509.364. Technical data: see description above. © The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 14a As 15, pictured at 150%.
- 15 Elagabalus in the name of Julia Paula (219–220), silver medallion. Dressel, *Medaillone*, no. 106. Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Münzkabinett 18205366, Acc. 1882/31 (16.51g, 12h, 35mm). <<https://ikmk.smb.museum/object?id=18205366>>. © Münzkabinett, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Photos by Reinhard Saczewski.

- 16 Elagabalus (218–222), antoninianus. Not in *RIC* or *BMCRE*. Schaad, *Le trésor d'Eauze*, pp. 228f. (type). Kunsthistorisches Museum Vienna, Münzkabinett, inv. RÖ 43082 (4.77g, 11h, 22.1mm; edge break; acquired from Otto Voetter in 1931). © KHM Vienna.
- 16a As 16, pictured at 200%.
- 17 Elagabalus (218–222), denarius. *RIC* 87. NAC 42 (20 November 2007), 379 (3.08g, 21mm).
- 18 The Vigna Barberini complex, drawing by N. André in collaboration with F. Villedieu, reproduced after Rowan, *Under Divine Auspices*, fig. 62.



1a (2.5x)



WOYTEK, ELAGABALUS AND THE *AEDES DEI INVICTI SOLIS ELAGABALI* (1)

PLATE 34



WOYTEK, ELAGABALUS AND THE *AEDES DEI INVICTI SOLIS ELAGABALI* (2)



9



10



11



12



12a (1.5x)



13



PLATE 36





